



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

M i F  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,250	03/07/2001	Jorgen Johansson	33208	4992

116 7590 03/14/2003

PEARNE & GORDON LLP  
526 SUPERIOR AVENUE EAST  
SUITE 1200  
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-1484

EXAMINER

DEXTER, CLARK F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3724

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

MP

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. <b>09/801,250</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Johansson</b>
	Examiner <b>Clark F. Dexter</b>	Art Unit <b>3724</b>

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Aaron Fishman

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mr. Clark Dexter

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Mar 12, 2003

Type: a) Telephonic      b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes    e) No. If yes, brief description:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: None

Identification of prior art discussed:

Bugbee, pn 146,648

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Fishman called to discuss the prior art rejection. Mr. Dexter maintained his position that magnetic holding devices are old and well known. Mr. Fishman stated that he was looking for guidance in how to obviate the rejection. Mr. Dexter suggested that there are numerous ways to attack the Examiner's rejection; specifically, applicant could argue the rejection (i.e., reasons why the combination is nonobvious), request evidence in support of the Examiner's taking of Official notice, and/or more specifically claim the structure of the invention such as the location/orientation of the magnet.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

CLARK F. DEXTER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 3724

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.